

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. LOTT. For the information of all Senators, a number of important measures are expected from the House on Monday. Senators are also reminded that the funding resolution for the Government expires on Monday at midnight unless the continuing resolution is signed into law.

Therefore, rollcall votes can be expected during Monday's session of the Senate but will not occur prior to the hour of 5:30 p.m. on Monday.

I further ask unanimous consent that following the appointment of conferees with respect to the reconciliation bill, the Chair lay before the Senate a message from the House on H.R. 927, the Cuban sanctions bill for the appointment of conferees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LOTT. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I now ask that the Senate stand in adjournment under the previous order following a speech by the Democratic leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

GENERAL LLOYD MOSES

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I would like to take this opportunity to recognize the outstanding life and military career of a veteran of the Second World War: Retired Major General Lloyd Moses who currently resides in Vermillion, SD.

General Moses came from humble beginnings. He was born in 1904 on what was then the Rosebud Sioux Indian Reservation in Fairfax, SD. His mother was half Sioux Indian. His father was a carpenter.

Despite not having a formal grade school education, General Moses graduated from High School and the Black Hills Teachers College, and obtained a degree in Chemistry from the University of South Dakota.

General Moses enjoyed a long and illustrious military career. In 1933, General Moses applied for Active Duty in the U.S. Army and was promoted to the rank of first lieutenant in 1935. During World War II, he served as a battalion commander of the 75th Infantry Division and volunteered to participate with the 507th Parachute Regiment, 17th Airborne Division in "Operation Varsity," the airborne assault across the Rhine River in 1945.

In the Korean War, General Moses commanded the 31st Infantry and in 1955 was promoted to the rank of brigadier general. In 1957, he was promoted to the rank of major general. General Moses reached the pinnacle of his mili-

tary career in 1960 when, following in the footsteps of other generals such as George McClellan, Andrew Jackson, and Ulysses S. Grant, he became commanding general of the 5th U.S. Army.

His military awards include the Distinguished Service Cross, the Silver Star for heroics in Korea, and the Distinguished Service Medal, the Nation's highest peacetime military award. General Moses retired in 1964 as the highest ranking South Dakotan ever to serve in the U.S. Army.

General Moses remains committed to the promise of education. After retiring from the military, General Moses returned to the University of South Dakota and became the director of the Institute for American Studies.

As an enrolled member of the Rosebud Sioux Tribe, he spent the next 10 years successfully expanding the curriculum of Native American courses at the University in an effort to teach cultural awareness and encourage the continued education of Native American youth. When he retired in 1974, the enrollment of Native American students at the University was at an all-time high, and the Institute for American Studies was rapidly becoming one of the foremost centers of oral history and tradition in the United States.

From such humble beginnings, General Lloyd Moses developed the leadership and education that helped our forces to victory in Europe 50-years ago and has continued to assist our growth as a Nation. His story is proof that great deeds can still come from hard work and a strong mind. And that great men can still come from small places like Fairfax, SD.

WELFARE

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I did not want to take a long time, but there are a couple of matters I want to address, and I will do that at this time. The first concerns a series of discussions that have been held now over the last several days about reports relating to welfare reform.

A recent report discussed in this morning's Washington Post relating to a study undertaken by the Department of Health and Human Services compares the welfare bills passed by the House and Senate and proposed by Senate Democrats. It examines the income distributional effects of the Republican budget, and it estimates how many children will be put into poverty by the various welfare plans.

The report uses two different definitions of poverty, the official poverty measure and an alternative. It is under the alternative, not the official measure, that over 1 million children are put into poverty.

The report represents a range for the Democratic alternatives because the Office of Management and Budget did not have the time to develop a full model of the effects of that plan.

Mr. President, I think it is very important to note that the 1.2 million fig-

ure is reached using an alternative definition of poverty never before relied upon by the Federal Government.

When people say "poverty," they usually mean the official poverty measure, which counts only a family's cash income such as AFDC and SSI and Social Security checks they receive.

Using the official measure of poverty, the Senate-passed bill would increase the number of children in poverty from 15.5 million to about 15.8 million, or an increase of 1.9 percent. Under the official poverty measure, the Senate Democratic alternative would not increase poverty at all.

Let me repeat that, Mr. President. Under the official poverty measure, the measure that we have used for decades, the Senate Democratic alternative would not increase poverty at all.

The alternative measure counts cash and in-kind income, such as food stamps and EITC, as well as AFDC, SSI, and Social Security, which exaggerates the poverty effect of the bill.

So while the numbers released concern me, I do not think that they ought to argue that somehow we ought to turn our backs on welfare reform. We simply cannot keep the status quo. We need to restructure our welfare system. We need to require people on welfare to work, and be responsible parents. We need to remember that the current system keeps 9 million children in poverty. That is the status quo, Mr. President. Nine million children today live in poverty as a result of the programs, the framework, and the institutions that we have in existence.

I want to make a couple of more points with regard to the numbers.

First, we should note that the statement that the Senate bill will put 1.2 million more children in poverty is based on an alternative definition, and that definition has never been used before.

Second, and perhaps more importantly, more children will be put into poverty only if the welfare system that we are proposing fails.

So I believe that we need to recognize four points, Mr. President, as we consider welfare reform.

First of all, the apples and oranges comparisons that the data makes is something that everybody ought to completely appreciate prior to the time we come to any conclusion. The fact is, using official poverty definitions, the Senate-passed bill does not increase the level of poverty for children at all.

We can say, regardless of whether one uses the official or the new alternative definition of poverty, that the Democratic bill is vastly superior to the Senate-passed bill, and the Senate-passed bill is at least four times superior than the House-passed bill.

So, as we have articulated all the way through this process, the Work First proposal that Democrats laid out that we debated, that we voted for unanimously, is by far the best version of all.

Second, I think it ought to be emphasized that no one said that this was the

last word on welfare reform. I do not know of a colleague on this side of the aisle who is content to say, all right, we have now done welfare reform, and there is nothing else to do. I think it is critical that everyone understand this is the first installment. This is the first opportunity for us to build a new infrastructure, to take what we have done, to analyze it, to see how well the States work with it, and to come up with ways in which to make it better in subsequent years. There is not one program that we have not done that with.

I submit that regardless of what happens on welfare, we are going to revisit this issue again and again.

So it is critical, it seems to me, that everyone understand. We want to build a new system, and we do it one step at a time. What we have attempted to do with the Senate-passed bill, with the Democratic bill in particular, is to provide the foundation.

Third, I think it is fair to say that it is vastly superior to the status quo. That was what we said before. I think the study confirms that it is better than the status quo now. What we have attempted to do is to improve upon the status quo, to create a new system, a new infrastructure, an emphasis on work, trying to get people off of welfare and into work, creating welfare opportunities in offices that will become work opportunities once this legislation passes.

So we are not satisfied with the status quo. We need to build upon it. We recognize the importance of creating new opportunities to do that. We do not want people on welfare. We want people to find new opportunities in work, in education, and in creating new lives. That is what this is designed to do.

Finally, I think it is very important that we know that much of what we did a couple of months ago as we considered welfare reform we did with an expectation that the other pieces of the safety net will still be there, that we will have an earned income tax credit that makes work pay, that we will do all we can to ensure kids are adequately cared for with regard to their nutritional needs, that we ensure everyone has at least a minimal amount of health care as a result of Medicare and Medicaid, that we do not gut the program today, to provide for meaningful housing. That safety net, regardless of what we do in welfare, is critical, if we indeed are concerned about not moving people back into poverty.

So I would only reiterate that we are beginning a process that will take some time to complete. We hope that we have created an opportunity for a lot of people at long last to make work pay, to find new ways to ensure that they will not be dependent upon welfare as they have in the past, recognizing that the status quo is unacceptable, and encouraging in as many ways as we can with new mechanisms so people can go out and find the jobs and

find the opportunities that we hope will be there as a result of what we are attempting to do now.

SETTING THE RECORD STRAIGHT

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I think it is important that I take just a moment to describe something I guess I never thought I would have to do, but I suppose it is important to set the record straight.

Somewhat baffling to me has been a debate over the public airwaves and in the press about what actually happened on the way to Israel. Did the President come back and talk to the leadership? Did he express his desire to work with the Republican leadership in an effort to resolve our outstanding differences? Senator DOLE, Speaker GINGRICH, Minority Leader GEPHARDT, myself, and others were on the airplane. The four of us were in a room that allowed us, I think, to safely say we know exactly what happened.

There is a contrast here that is very interesting to me. In my view, Senator DOLE, our majority leader, has taken the high road in this whole debate and has made it very clear that he is not going to become involved in it. I applaud him for taking that position. At least, as I understand it, that is his position. I have not heard him make any public comment on it. Unfortunately, the Speaker, for whatever reason, has chosen to make this an issue.

I can recall at least a half dozen occasions the President, during that very brief trip, both coming and going, came back and talked to us, expressed a desire to work together to find ways in which to resolve our difficulties with the debt limit, with the continuing resolution, with reconciliation. He expressed a desire to get together. He made the effort to suggest that whenever there was an understanding about what the consensus was with regard to the debt limit and the continuing resolution, we would be ready to go to work.

I do not know what else he could have done, frankly. No one has ever faulted the President for not being gregarious. He demonstrated that quality in spades on his way over and on the way back. I think he could probably tell you from memory what books each one of us were reading. He checked them all out, asked about them.

So, Mr. President, I think it is a silly debate. I hope we get it behind us. We have much more important things to talk about. But I do think it is important to set the record straight for fear that somebody out there might have thought that during this entire trip there was no dialog, no discussion, no discourse on what we ought to do, no opportunities to talk about what we have attempted to do here today.

There was a great deal of opportunity. And the hallways work both ways. I do not recall the Speaker making any effort to go to the head of the plane. If he was so concerned, if he

wanted to speak with the President, I did not see any guard saying the Speaker is not allowed up into the front section of the airplane.

But, again, it is silly. The issue is, can we put aside our differences and begin working in a meaningful way to accomplish what we know we must against very difficult deadlines?

So I hope in good faith we can do that. We made an effort at that today, and I know we will again on Monday. I know the President cares deeply about using every opportunity he has available to him to ensure that the dialog is there, the opportunities for discussion are there, and the opportunities to resolve these outstanding differences be created whenever possible. He did that on the airplane going over. He did that on the airplane going back. He will do it again next week. He will do it whenever the situation arises.

With that, I yield the floor. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The leader should understand that we are under a unanimous consent order to adjourn.

Mr. DOLE. I ask unanimous-consent that following my statement, we do that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, this Saturday, November 11, America will celebrate Veterans Day—the day we set aside to honor the men and women who defend our country and preserve our peace and freedom.

Veterans Day was originally called Armistice Day. It was first celebrated in 1919, to mark the end of a war that was to have ended all wars.

Two years later, the remains of four unknown American soldiers were brought to a town square in a small French town. An American sergeant placed a bouquet of white roses on one of the caskets, designating the American Unknown Soldier of World War I.

The casket was brought across the Atlantic, and our Nation laid this hero to rest in Arlington National Cemetery on November 11, 1921.

Seventy-four years have now passed since that ceremony, and in that time, thanks in part to the efforts of the citizens of Emporia, KS, Armistice Day became Veterans Day.

That change became necessary because, as we all know, the First World War did not end all wars. Today, caskets bearing the remains of other Unknown Soldiers who fought in World War II, in Korea, and in Vietnam, now rest in Arlington alongside countless other American heroes.

Mr. President, in the early days of World War II, Gen. George Marshall